

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on December 16, 2003. Claims 1-4 and 6 have been amended. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims in their pre-amended form in this and other applications. New claims 11-20 have been added without adding new matter. Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

The Office Action Summary Sheet, in paragraph 10, indicates that the drawings filed on "02 August 2000" are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants wish to note that formal drawings were filed in this case on November 7, 2000, and the Applicants respectfully request approval of the formal drawings.

The disclosure is objected to due to several informalities. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful reading of the specification. As suggested, the identified grammatical and typographical errors have been corrected. Applicants wish to note that the informality identified in paragraph 2.c. of the Office Action could not be found in the specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Farros et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,930,810 (hereinafter "Farros"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The present invention relates to creating name cards, or business cards, and, more specifically, adding new information to existing business cards. A problem addressed by the invention is that when business cards need to be updated with new information, the cards need to be reprinted again at a significant cost. This is particularly expensive when cards need to be replaced for a large group of people. Specification, page 3, lines 1-13. The specification discloses a method, and an apparatus for implementing the method, for printing additional information, such as photographs or other information, in blank regions of existing cards. For example, in one embodiment of the invention, the apparatus may have a reading section for reading the layout of an existing business card, an input

section for inputting new or additional information, and a section for allocating the additional information to a blank space on the business card. Then, through a printing process, the new information is added to the existing cards. See, for example, page 4, lines 5-18; page 14, line 21 - page 16, line 5, and accompanying figures of the specification.

Claim 1 has been amended to better describe the invention. Amended claim 1 recites a name card creating apparatus comprising a “fetching means for fetching layout information printed on a name card; [and a] display means for displaying the layout information printed on the name card.” Claim 1 further recites an “input means for inputting additional information; information allocating means for allocating the additional information ... to a predetermined blank space region in the layout ...; and printing means for ... printing the additional information in the blank space.” Emphasis added.

Farros fails to teach or suggest these claim limitations. Farros relates to a printing system with pre-defined forms that are modifiable by a user. Farros teaches that the printed product may take the form of a business card, and discloses that the “changeable features of the business card include the text, design and logo.” Col. 8, ll. 1-7. The Office Action asserts that Farros teaches a “fetching means for fetching layout information (Fig. 3 ref. no. 302, where computer with a display screen (308) showing a business card option when selected, computer fetches format information of predefined name cards read from a program module (206)).” Office Action, page 3.

Even assuming this characterization of Farros were correct, it has little to do with the claimed invention. As the Office Action stated, Farros “fetches format information of predefined name cards read from a program module.” This means that Farros simply has stored formats for business cards that a user may utilize to create a new card. This does not mean, however, that Farros teaches or suggests “fetching layout information printed on a name card.” The claimed invention, as explained above, is directed toward supplementing existing information on business cards with additional information. As such, existing business cards need not be thrown away when additional

information is required on the cards; rather, the cards are supplemented with the additional information. Farros does not contemplate this type of system or method.

For at least these reasons Farros fails to anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 4 and 10 depend from claim 1 and contain every limitation of claim 1. Claims 2, 4 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons for allowance of claim 1, and also because the unique combinations recited by these dependent claims are neither taught nor suggested by Farros. For example, claim 2 recites that the “fetching means fetches the name card having information printed thereon and reads the layout thereof.” Farros fails to teach or suggest this limitation, and this is another reason why claim 2 is allowable.

Claims 3, 5-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Farros as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Stechmann et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,617,528 (hereinafter “Stechmann”). And, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Farros as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Egashira et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,336,657 (hereinafter “Egashira”).

These rejections are respectfully traversed because they are based upon the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Farros. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Farros, and neither Stechmann nor Egashira add anything to Farros to remedy its deficiencies with respect to claim 1. Claims 3 and 5-9 depend from claim 1 and contain every limitation of claim, and are allowable for at least the reasons for allowance of claim 1 discussed above. Further, Applicants do not agree that the references are properly combinable as suggested in the Office Action.

New claims 11-20 have been added to round out the scope of protection afforded the invention. No new matter has been added. New claim 11 recites a “card reading section ... reading existing information printed on cards; a display section ... displaying the existing information read by said card reading section; an input section receiving additional information for said cards having existing information; and an allocation section allocating said additional information to an area of said card.” New

claims 12-17 depend from claim 11. New claim 18 recites a method comprising "reading information existing on a name card; displaying said information existing on said name card; inputting additional information to be displayed on said name card; and allocating said additional information to an area of said business card." New claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18. New claims 11-20 contain limitations which are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, and are thus believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: March 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Peter A. Veytsman

Registration No.: 45,920

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant